



## **DRAFT MINUTES**

### **LAFCO REGULAR MEETING**

**Wednesday, December 14, 2005, 9:00 a.m.**

**Planning Commission Hearing Room, Hall of Administration  
10 Civic Center Plaza, Santa Ana**

*(Any member of the public may request to speak on any agenda item at the time that item is being considered by the Commission.)*

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

**Chair Susan Wilson** called the regular meeting of the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to order at 9:03 a.m.

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**Commissioner Arlene Schafer** led the pledge of allegiance.

**3. ROLL CALL**

The following commissioners and alternates were present:

- **Commissioner Robert Bouer**
- **Commissioner Peter Herzog**
- **Commissioner Arlene Schafer**
- **Commissioner Susan Wilson**
- **Commissioner Thomas Wilson**
- **Commissioner John Withers**
- **Alternate Commissioner Rhonda McCune**
- **Alternate Commissioner Charley Wilson**

The following LAFCO staff members were present:

- General Counsel Scott C. Smith
- Executive Officer Joyce Crosthwaite
- Assistant Executive Officer Bob Aldrich
- Project Manager Carolyn Emery
- Project Manager Kim Koeppen
- Communications Analyst Danielle Ball
- Administrative Assistant Daphne Charles

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a.) November 9, 2005 – Regular Commission Meeting

**MOTION:** Approve minutes from November 9, 2005 as presented and without revision (Tom Wilson)

**SECOND:** Arlene Schafer

**FOR:** Robert Bouer, Peter Herzog, Arlene Schafer, Susan Wilson, Tom Wilson, John Withers

**AGAINST:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**MOTION PASSED**

**5. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Chair S. Wilson** requested public comments on any non-agenda item. Receiving no comments, she closed public comments.

**Commissioner Patsy Marshall** entered the Commission meeting during the public comment period.

**6. CONSENT CALENDAR**

None

**7. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

a.) Sphere of Influence Review for the East Orange County Water District (SOI 05-42)

b.) Tonner Hills Annexation to the City of Brea (CA 03-12)

**7a. Sphere of Influence Review for the East Orange County Water District (SOI 05-42)**

Project Manager Koeppen presented the staff report for the Sphere of Influence Review for the East Orange County Water District (SOI 05-42), which was continued from the September 2005 and October 2005 Commission meetings. She summarized staff activity regarding the project since October, including a meeting with district representatives in November. She further summarized correspondence submitted by the district, Foothill Community Association, Municipal Water District of Orange County (MWDOC), and City of Tustin. She added that staff received a letter from one of the district's board members in support of a transitional sphere of influence, as recommended by staff.

**Chair S. Wilson** opened the public hearing.

Doug Chapman, Board member from the East Orange County Water District (EOCWD), requested that the Commission grant EOCWD a coterminous rather than transitional sphere of influence. He clarified the board president's letter, acknowledging that the district had not voted on reorganizing with the City of Tustin's water services nor discussed the possibility with city officials. He said that the district operates and maintains its wholesale and retail facilities efficiently.

**Commissioner Bill Campbell** entered the Commission meeting during Mr. Chapman's comments.

Harvey Gobas, engineer from the East Orange County Water District, explained that the board's president was unable to attend the LAFCO meeting due to surgery. He indicated that EOCWD disagreed with staff's recommendations.

Bill Huston, the Tustin city manager, stated that the city operates and maintains its own independent water system and has no interest in reorganizing with EOCWD.

Receiving no further comment, **Chair S. Wilson** closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner Schafer** moved to adopt a coterminous sphere of influence as requested by the district.

**Commissioner Campbell** seconded Ms. Schafer's motion, saying that the Commission would revisit EOCWD's sphere of influence again in a few years both when it reviews the City of Tustin's sphere and during the next five-year sphere cycle.

**Commissioner Herzog** stated that assigning a coterminous sphere of influence would send a message that the status quo is acceptable, while assigning a transitional sphere would signal that the district should continue discussions and explore its future options. He made a counter motion to approve staff recommendations as presented, including the adoption of a transitional sphere of influence for the district. **Chair S. Wilson** seconded the motion.

At **Commissioner Withers'** request, Executive Officer Crosthwaite explained the four sphere of influence options the Commission could choose from and the implications of each.

Legal Counsel Smith said that state law mandates that the agencies' spheres be reviewed every five years. He said each agency's sphere designation is at the discretion of the Commission and can change with each subsequent sphere review. He reiterated that a transitional sphere designation indicates that the Commission believes that the agency should discuss reorganization with another agency. It does not necessarily mean that the Commission will take such action but rather is a tool to stimulate discussion among agencies regarding future service provision.

Referring to an email message from the City of Tustin, **Commissioner Marshall** asked if the city had any interest in assuming EOCWD's operations at some point in the future. Ms. Crosthwaite responded that assigning a transitional sphere would encourage discussions in that regard.

**Commissioner Campbell** stated that discussion among the agencies would continue regardless of the sphere designation assigned to EOCWD by the Commission. He suggested that the Commission wait until a full series of municipal service reviews were complete before assigning a transitional sphere to the district, adding that the Commission would then have more facts upon which to base its decision.

**Commissioner Herzog** argued that it is the Commission's obligation to send a clear message to the district: EOCWD should engage in serious discussions with other agencies about future reorganization. He commented that a coterminous sphere would likely stall such discussions.

**Chair S. Wilson** concurred with **Commissioner Herzog's** comments, stating that a transitional sphere designation would stimulate dialogue about future service provision.

**Commissioner Schafer** said the designation of a transitional sphere was unnecessary; EOCWD is already in the process of considering its options.

**Commissioner Withers** acknowledged **Commissioner Herzog's** point of view but expressed concern that the transitional sphere label could have negative implications for EOCWD as it engages in negotiations with other agencies. He expressed confidence in earlier statements about the district's ongoing discussions, as the subject service territory is within his supervisory district. He voiced his support for **Commissioner Schafer's** original motion.

**Commissioner Bouer** questioned the merit of assigning a coterminous sphere to the district.

Prompted by a question posed by **Commissioner Campbell**, Executive Officer Crosthwaite stated that the City of Tustin's municipal service review was scheduled for 2007.

**Chair S. Wilson** voiced her support of a transitional sphere as a means to signal that this is not a reprieve for the district. She noted that assigning a coterminous sphere should not be interpreted that the status quo will be acceptable.

**Commissioner T. Wilson** indicated that he would defer to **Commissioner Campbell's** opinion. He said that the territory was in his own supervisorial district prior to redistricting and suggested waiting until the City of Tustin's MSR is completed before assigning a transitional sphere. He indicated that the Commission's message to the district has been very clear regardless of the final sphere designation chosen.

**Chair S. Wilson** called for a roll call vote.

**MOTION:** Approve staff recommendations and sphere determinations for the East Orange County Water District (SOI 05-42) (Peter Herzog)  
**SECOND:** Susan Wilson  
**FOR:** Robert Bouer, Peter Herzog, Susan Wilson  
**AGAINST:** Bill Campbell, Arlene Schafer, Thomas Wilson, John Withers  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**MOTION FAILED**

**MOTION:** Approve staff recommendations, amending sphere determinations for the East Orange County Water District (SOI 05-42) to reflect a coterminous rather than transitional sphere of influence (Arlene Schafer)  
**SECOND:** Bill Campbell  
**FOR:** Robert Bouer, Bill Campbell, Arlene Schafer, Thomas Wilson, John Withers  
**AGAINST:** Peter Herzog, Susan Wilson  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**MOTION PASSED**

**Commissioner Campbell** reiterated that the Commission expects EOCWD to continue its discussions with other agencies regarding future service provision and potential reorganization in the future.

**7b. Tonner Hills Annexation to the City of Brea (CA 03-12)**

Assistant Executive Officer Aldrich presented the staff report for the Tonner Hills Annexation to the City of Brea (CA 03-12), which was continued from the November 2005 meeting. He noted that the project had been on the Commission's work plan for the past six years. He explained that the original application, as submitted by the applicant, called for the annexation of 838 acres of unincorporated territory to the City of Brea and added that staff recommended the annexation of an additional 300 acres located south and east of Tonner Hills to avoid the creation of an unincorporated island. He summarized staff's recommendations for the approval of the annexation, including the adoption of a revised resolution, which staff provided to the Commission in advance of the meeting.

At the request of **Commissioner Schafer**, Mr. Aldrich clarified the total acreage owned by the Army Corps of Engineers.

**Commissioner Bouer** complimented staff for its diligence over the years.

Assistant Executive Officer Aldrich noted that the property owners and LAFCO staff has changed during the six years staff worked on the project. He credited Executive Officer Crosthwaite for her significant role in managing negotiations among the stakeholders.

**Chair S. Wilson** opened the public hearing.

Ron Metzler, a representative of Shea Homes, commented regarding the complexity of the project and the difficulty the parties had in coming to an agreement on the annexation of the property to the City of Brea. He recognized LAFCO staff, to which he attributed the eventual success of the project.

**Chair S. Wilson** asked why the parties had not yet signed the pre-annexation agreement. Mr. Metzler responded that some minor changes incorporated into the agreement had caused some delay, but he assured the Commission that the parties were aligned and ready to execute the agreement.

Tim O'Donnell, Brea's city manager, commented about the long and arduous process the parties endured to bring the annexation proposal to fruition. He thanked LAFCO for keeping everyone's "feet to the fire." Further, he requested that the Commission continue its consideration of the proposal so that the Brea city council would have the opportunity to thoroughly review the written agreement before its execution.

**Chair S. Wilson** expressed her confusion regarding the city's request for a continuance. Mr. O'Donnell assured the Commission that the city was nearly ready to execute the agreement and simply wanted the opportunity to pore over the final written document.

John Beauman, councilman from the City of Brea, stated that the city firmly believed that annexation was the right thing to do but wanted the courtesy to review the finer points before it executes the agreement.

**Vice Chair Bouer** asked how much time the city wanted to consider the final agreement. Executive Officer Crosthwaite explained that, if continued, the proposal would be brought back before the Commission in February 2006, as the Commission would not convene a regular meeting in January.

George Basye, a representative of Aera Energy, thanked LAFCO staff and the members of the stakeholder group for their good faith efforts. He stated that he supported staff recommendations regarding the annexation of additional territory to avoid the creation an unincorporated island.

Assistant Executive Officer Aldrich listed the agencies/organizations that participated in the stakeholder group discussions per **Commissioner Schafer's** request.

Stephanie Ord, an attorney from Latham & Watkins LLP representing the Tonner Canyon LLC, expressed her concern that the City of Brea would attempt to annex additional territory belonging to the City of Industry as part of the annexation proposal before the Commission.

**Commissioner McCune** clarified that none of the territory under consideration by the Commission belonged to the City of Industry.

Michele Vadon, city attorney from the City of Industry, explained that there were rumors that the City of Brea would propose to add extra territory to the annexation during the public hearing. She said that she attended the public hearing to protect the City of Industry's interests.

Charlie View, the City of Brea's Development Services Director, clarified the city's desire for a continuance, explaining that certain language recently added to the agreement regarding open space had significant implications to the city. He added that a continuance would not have an adverse impact on the development schedule.

**Chair S. Wilson** asked Mr. Metzler of Shea Homes if he anticipated any adverse impact resultant of a continuance. Mr. Metzler responded that, while

the development schedule would not suffer as a result, Shea was anxious to end the cycle of renegotiation. He encouraged the Commission to approve the annexation so that the parties could move forward.

Receiving no further comment, **Chair S. Wilson** closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner Campbell** commented that neither the City of Brea nor the County had signed the pre-annexation agreement. He asked who had the authority to stop the annexation if the agreement was never executed.

Executive Officer Crosthwaite explained that Shea Homes' objection to the annexation during the protest period would terminate the annexation. She added that both the City of Brea and the County would have the right to file a request for reconsideration for a 30-day period following the Commission's approval of the annexation.

**Commissioner Campbell** voiced his support for approving the annexation and encouraged the Commission to approve the annexation. He reminded his fellow commissioners that Shea Homes had a viable development agreement with the County when it purchased the property two years ago and had offered in good faith to engage in discussions with the City of Brea. He made a motion to approve the Tonner Hills annexation to the City of Brea subject to the terms and conditions outlined in the draft resolution before the Commission. **Commissioner T. Wilson** seconded the motion.

**Commissioner Bouer** echoed **Commissioner Campbell's** comments in support of the Commission's approval of the proposal without continuance.

**Commissioner Schafer** asked for a timeline following the Commission's approval of the proposal. Executive Officer Crosthwaite explained that the parties had until January 31, 2006 to execute the pre-annexation agreement. She added that, without the executed pre-annexation agreement, the resolution delineated default parameters that would take effect. She reminded the Commission that the 30-day request for reconsideration period would begin on December 15, 2006.

Responding to a question posed by **Commissioner Herzog**, Ms. Crosthwaite stated that, if approved by the Commission today, staff would likely file the certificate of completion with the County Clerk-Recorder in February or March 2006.

**Commissioner Herzog** asked that some clarification language be added to the draft resolution. Staff noted that "upon the effective date" should be added to term and condition "h," "i," and "j." Legal counsel agreed, and



**Commissioner Campbell** amended his original motion to incorporate **Commissioner Herzog's** recommended revisions to the draft resolution.

At **Commissioner McCune's** request, Assistant Executive Officer Aldrich explained the differences between the revised draft resolution before the Commission and the resolution that staff distributed with the agenda packet the previous week. He stated that item "p" on page 7 had been pulled from the cooperative agreement and added to the terms and conditions.

**MOTION:**            **Approve the Tonner Hills Annexation to the City of Brea (CA 03-12), revising the draft resolution as discussed (Bill Campbell)**  
**SECOND:**           **Tom Wilson**  
**FOR:**                **Robert Bouer, Bill Campbell, Peter Herzog, Arlene Schafer, Susan Wilson, Tom Wilson, John Withers**  
**AGAINST:**          **None**  
**ABSTAIN:**          **None**  
**MOTION PASSED**

**Commissioner T. Wilson** exited the Commission meeting.

## **8. PUBLIC HEARING**

- a.) Knudson Annexation to the Orange County Sanitation District (DA 05-18)
- b.) Santiago Hills II Annexation to the City of Orange (CA 00-14)
- c.) East Orange Planning Area 1 Reorganization (RO 04-16)

### **8a. Knudson Annexation to the Orange County Sanitation District (DA 05-18)**

Project Manager Emery presented the staff report for the Knudson Annexation to the Orange County Sanitation District (DA 05-18), which was comprised of the annexation of approximately 7.12 acres of territory located in unincorporated North Tustin to the Orange County Sanitation District for the purpose extending sewer service to nine existing single-family homes and one single-family home currently under development. She explained that staff recommended that the Commission assign a 21-day protest period, as one of the property owners did not submit a signed consent form.

**Chair S. Wilson** opened the public hearing. Receiving no comments, she then closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner Herzog** made a motion to approve the annexation subject to the terms and conditions outlined in the draft resolution. **Commissioner Campbell** seconded the motion.

**Commissioner Marshall** noted that the map of the area demonstrated that the annexation territory was not contiguous with the Orange County Sanitation District's (OCSD) current service territory. Project Manager Emery responded that the area's property owners annex to the district as they want to transition from private septic systems to public sewer services.

Executive Officer Crosthwaite explained that health and safety issues allow LAFCO annex non-contiguous territory. She added that OCSD was working toward submitting a "blanket annexation" proposal, whereby it would annex much of the unincorporated area within its sphere of influence, including the entirety of North Tustin and Orange Park Acres, rather than force property owners to do piecemeal annexations.

**MOTION:**            **Approve the Knudson Annexation to OCSD (DA 05-18) subject to the terms and conditions outlined in the draft resolution and assign a 21-day protest period (Peter Herzog)**  
**SECOND:**        **Bill Campbell**  
**FOR:**             **Robert Bouer, Bill Campbell, Peter Herzog, Arlene Schafer, Susan Wilson, John Withers**  
**AGAINST:**       **None**  
**ABSTAIN:**      **None**  
**MOTION PASSED**

**8b.     Santiago Hills II Annexation to the City of Orange (CA 00-14)**

Project Manager Koeppen presented the staff report for the Santiago Hills II Annexation to the City of Orange (CA 00-14), which was comprised of the annexation of 535 acres of residential and open space territory to the City of Orange. She summarized staff's recommendations for the approval of the annexation, including the adoption of a revised resolution, which staff provided to the Commission in advance of the meeting, and assigning a 21-day protest period.

**Commissioner Withers** exited the Commission meeting during Ms. Koeppen's presentation.

**Chair S. Wilson** opened the public hearing for the Santiago Hills II annexation.

Eileen McCarthy, attorney from the Public Law Center, presented written comments to the Commission and expressed her concern about affordable housing in the City of Orange. She opined that it was LAFCO's obligation to ensure that the planned development properly accommodated the city's transfer of Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocations.

**Commissioner Withers** reentered the Commission meeting during Ms. McCarthy's comments.

Receiving no further response, **Chair S. Wilson** closed the public hearing for the Santiago Hills II annexation.

**Commissioner Marshall** clarified the sewer service provider.

**MOTION:** Approve the Santiago Hills II Annexation to the City of Orange (CA 00-14) subject to the terms and conditions outlined in the draft resolution and assign a 21-day protest period (Bill Campbell)  
**SECOND:** Robert Bouer  
**FOR:** Robert Bouer, Bill Campbell, Peter Herzog, Arlene Schafer, Susan Wilson, John Withers  
**AGAINST:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**MOTION PASSED**

**8c. East Orange Planning Area 1 Reorganization (RO 04-16)**

Project Manager Koeppen presented the staff report for the East Orange Planning Area 1 Reorganization (RO 04-16), which was comprised of several concurrent actions: 1) the annexation of approximately 409 acres of unincorporated territory within the City of Orange's sphere of influence to the City of Orange; 2) the annexation of a portion of East Orange Planning Area 1, approximately 105 acres of territory, to both the Irvine Ranch Water District and the Orange County Sanitation District; 3) the concurrent detachment of the same 105 acres from the Santiago County Water District's service territory; and 4) the amendment of the Orange County Sanitation District's sphere of influence to include the same 105 acres of territory.

Ms. Koeppen summarized staff's recommendations for the approval of the reorganization, including the adoption of a revised resolution, which staff provided to the Commission in advance of the meeting, and assigning a 21-day protest period. She added that one of the terms and conditions allows the Irvine Ranch Water District to form improvement districts.

As a clarification point, **Commissioner Campbell** verified that the Santiago County Water District supported the detachment as the first step in an eventual consolidation proposal with the Irvine Ranch Water District, which will be considered by the Commission in the spring.

**Chair S. Wilson** opened the public hearing for the East Orange Planning Area 1 reorganization.

Eileen McCarthy, attorney from the Public Law Center, again expressed her concern about the lack of affordable housing in the City of Orange and the city's seeming disregard for meeting its RHNA allocation. When asked by **Chair S. Wilson** about the legal consequences to the city and County, Ms. McCarthy responded that litigation could stall development county-wide if the Public Law Center won a court injunction disallowing the issuance of permits in Orange County.

Dan Miller, Vice President of Government Relations for The Irvine Company, stated that the RHNA allocation was an issue to be negotiated between the City of Orange and the County, not a LAFCO obligation. He stated that the Public Law Center was using this particular development project as a platform to voice its concerns about the lack of affordable housing county-wide.

**Chair S. Wilson** asked if there is a particular protocol that developers must follow for integrating affordable housing units into new development areas. Mr. Miller responded that the policies vary according the city but said that, in this instance, The Irvine Company would incorporate affordable housing as specified by the city.

Executive Officer Crosthwaite commented that LAFCO had previously drafted a proactive policy that mandated the transfer of negotiated RHNA numbers between the city and County prior to the Commission's approval of an annexation. She said that the policy was unsuccessful and was rescinded in February 2005.

**Commissioner Herzog** expounded on the very complicated nature of affordable housing on a regional level.

**Commissioner Campbell** offered to invite the Director of Planning to present an explanation of how the County is addressing affordable housing county-wide at a future Commission meeting.

Receiving no further response, **Chair S. Wilson** closed the public hearing for the East Orange Planning Area 1 reorganization.

**MOTION:** Approve the East Orange Planning Area 1  
Reorganization (RO 04-16) subject to the terms and  
conditions outlined in the draft resolution and assign a  
21-day protest period (Robert Bouer)

**SECOND:** Bill Campbell

**FOR:** Robert Bouer, Bill Campbell, Peter Herzog, Arlene  
Schafer, Susan Wilson, John Withers

**AGAINST:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**MOTION PASSED**

**9. COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

- a.) Inventory of Services Provided by Community Services Districts
- b.) Financial Disclosure & Lobby Provisions
- c.) 2006 LAFCO Calendar Revision
- d.) Orange County Leadership Symposium V

**9a. Inventory of Services Provided by Community Services Districts**

Project Manager Emery stated that key changes to the state laws governing community services districts (CSDs) completed in 2005 include a definition of “latent powers” as those services and facilities that a LAFCO determines that a CSD did not provide before January 1, 2006. She explained that staff notified each of Orange County’s five CSDs that any service that the CSD was not actively providing as of December 31, 2005 is considered a “latent power” and that district would not be able to add those services in the future without LAFCO authorization effective January 1, 2006.

Ms. Emery presented a revised “Attachment B,” a matrix delineating the service inventory of each of Orange County’s five CSDs. She stated that those services would be reviewed during the districts’ respective municipal service reviews. She further added that LAFCO staff would utilize language consistent with the newly revised CSD law in future updates.

John McDermott, Board VP of the Emerald Bay Community Services District, objected to the matrix delineating the service inventory of each of Orange County’s five CSDs, as it did not utilize language consistent with the July 2005 revision to the CSD law. He further objected to LAFCO staff’s representation of EBSD’s fire protection services. He stated that the district has its own station and the largest volunteer fire service in the county. Further, he clarified that the district does not engage in general street maintenance, just repairs related to sewer/water projects.

**Commissioner Schafer** and **Chair S. Wilson** commented that they toured EBSD's facilities when the district petitioned the Commission to add water provision to its services.

**Commissioner McCune** clarified that the Commission was in receipt of the latest matrix delineating the service inventory of each of Orange County's five CSDs.

**MOTION:**           **Receive and file (Bill Campbell)**  
**SECOND:**       **Arlene Schafer**  
**FOR:**           **Robert Bouer, Bill Campbell, Peter Herzog, Arlene**  
                      **Schafer, Susan Wilson, John Withers**  
**AGAINST:**       **None**  
**ABSTAIN:**       **None**  
**MOTION PASSED**

**9b.   Financial Disclosure & Lobby Provisions**

Executive Officer Crosthwaite commented that the recent defeat of the proposed island annexation to the City of Anaheim raised issues regarding contributions from groups opposed to the annexation. She said that the Commission considered the adoption of a policy related to financial disclosure and lobby provisions in 2001 but decided against it due to limited staff resources and lack of enforcement mechanisms.

Ms. Crosthwaite presented the March 2001 staff report and meeting minutes and asked that the Commission review the previous staff report and reaffirm the previous Commission decision to forego a formal policy.

**Commissioner Campbell** asked that staff consider the development of a policy and come back to the Commission with recommendations during its February 2006 policies and procedures update.

**MOTION:**           **Reaffirm the March 2001 Commission decision; direct**  
                      **staff to return to the Commission with**  
                      **recommendations in February 2006 (Peter Herzog)**  
**SECOND:**       **Bill Campbell**  
**FOR:**           **Robert Bouer, Bill Campbell, Peter Herzog, Arlene**  
                      **Schafer, Susan Wilson, John Withers**  
**AGAINST:**       **None**  
**ABSTAIN:**       **None**  
**MOTION PASSED**

**9c. 2006 LAFCO Calendar Revision**

Executive Officer Crosthwaite explained that the Planning Commission Hearing Room is unavailable on June 14, 2006 due to the Board of Supervisors' scheduled budget hearings. The Commission discussed its options and revised its 2006 calendar, moving the June 2006 meeting to June 7, 2006, the first Wednesday in June.

**MOTION:**        **Revise LAFCO's 2006 calendar, changing the June meeting date to June 7, 2006 (Peter Herzog)**  
**SECOND:**       **Bill Campbell**  
**FOR:**           **Robert Bouer, Peter Herzog, Arlene Schafer, Susan Wilson, John Withers**  
**AGAINST:**       **None**  
**ABSTAIN:**      **None**  
**MOTION PASSED**

**9d. Orange County Leadership Symposium V**

Executive Officer Crosthwaite reminded the Commission that the fifth annual Orange County Leadership Symposium would convene January 13 through January 15, 2006 at the UCLA Conference Center in Lake Arrowhead. She asked those commissioners attending the symposium to contact staff about potential carpool coordination.

**10. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

**Commissioner Herzog** asked that the Commission revisit its sphere of influence policy during the January 2006 strategic planning session. He expressed disappointment that the Commission would include a "transitional sphere" designation in the policy and not assign it to an agency that meets the criteria.

**11. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS & ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None

**12. CLOSED SESSION**

None

**13. ADJOURNMENT**

**Chair S. Wilson** adjourned the meeting at 11:07 a.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

JOYCE CROSTHWAITE  
Executive Officer  
Orange County Local Agency Formation Commission

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Danielle M. Ball  
Communications Analyst/Commission Clerk